

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 21-30 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in lines 10-14 on page 21 and in lines 7-13 on page 29 of the application as originally filed.

**Specification**

The specification stands objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claim language "computer-usable medium." In response, Applicant has amended claims 21-30 to recite a "computer-readable storage medium," which is supported by lines 7-13 on page 29 of the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

I. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24, and 26-30 stand rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Rajarajan (6,950,990), Anderson (6,282,551) and Chien (5,852,733).

A patent may not be obtained if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a

whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Without admitting to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant amends claims 1, 11, and 21 to recite scanning for anchors embedded within said electronic document, said embedded anchors not displayed in the first window, wherein each of said embedded anchors specifies a predetermined location within said electronic document and each of said embedded anchors includes a predetermined descriptive label corresponding to information stored at the predetermined location.

Column 29, lines 8-59 of Rajarajan discloses a pair of drop down menus, where each menu, each time it is displayed, displays the same content. Rajarajan does not teach or suggest anchors embedded in an electronic document. Rajarajan also fails to teach that a descriptive label corresponding to information stored at a predetermined location. Anderson and Chien also fail to teach the features of claims 1, 11 and 21. Accordingly, claims 1, 11 and 21 are patentable over the combination of Rajarajan, Anderson, and Chien. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 11 and 21 and their associated dependent claims.

II. Claims 5, 15, and 25 stand rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Rajarajan, Anderson, Chien, and the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Claims 5, 15, and 25 depend upon claims 1, 11, and 21, which are

patentable over the combination of Rajarajan, Anderson, and Chien for the reasons stated above. The AAPA does not correct the shortcomings of Rajarajan, Anderson, and Chien because the AAPA does not teach the claimed scanning. Accordingly, claims 5, 15, and 25 are patentable over the combination of Rajarajan, Anderson, Chien, and the AAPA. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 5, 15, and 25.

**SUMMARY**

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Please charge any additional fees under 37 CFR §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.20 and 1.21 that may be required to maintain pendency of the present application, or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-3781.

Respectfully submitted,

MANFRED BARTZ

Date: July 31, 2009

/Lucinda G. Price/

Lucinda G. Price  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,270  
(408) 545-7194